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1.0 INTRODUCTION

This document reflects the work of the President’s Working Group on Faculty Issues. The group used the 1996 “Teaching Faculty Evaluation Instrument” as a template for its work and, in consultation with a faculty evaluation expert, sought to address the problems and concerns the original document produced. In addition to language and process clarifications, the major changes involve the number of evaluation categories and the scoring system.

The guiding principle for this revised system is that merit pay should reward and encourage outstanding and professional achievement and productivity. The system is designed to provide a systematic and objective means of ensuring that salary raises are based on documented performance. Teaching faculty will be evaluated on the way they support the instructional process and thereby foster the University’s mission. The following sections will include specific details on the evaluation categories, portfolio submission, scoring procedures, release time, merit-pay allocation, and process compliance.

2.0 EVALUATION CATEGORIES

The categories to be evaluated are (I) Teaching, (II) Research--Scholarly Activity and Grantsmanship, and (III) Service and Professional Development. These categories will be assessed by three rating sources: students, peers (departmental evaluation committees), and department chairs/deans. The ratings from each source will be placed on a specifically designed rating summary form. Students will complete the Course Evaluation Instrument each semester for the purpose of rating classes and instructors. These instruments will be scored and summarized by ITS. Overall Course Evaluation ratings for 'instructional design' and 'instructional delivery' will be provided to the faculty and the department and used as a part of the teaching faculty evaluation. The peers and the department chair/dean will use faculty submitted portfolios for their assessment and rating of the faculty. The procedures for scoring and obtaining an overall rating are outlined in the procedures section. Faculty will be rated using a 4-point scale. The Descriptors associated with the ratings are:

EP = Exemplary Performance = 4  
PL = Professional Level Performance = 3  
IR = Improvement Required = 2  
UN = Unsatisfactory = 1

For Merit Pay purposes, these are defined below:

EP = Exemplary Performance

This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently exceeded the institution’s standards of professional performance. Individuals receiving this rating stand as exemplars of the highest levels of professional academic performance within the institution,
making significant contributions to their department, college, academic field, and society.

**PL = Professional Level Performance**
This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, consistently met the institution’s standards of professional performance. The individuals receiving this rating constitute those good and valued professionals on whom the continued successful achievement of the institution’s mission, goals, and objectives depends.

**IR = Improvement Required**
This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, did not consistently meet the institution’s standards of professional performance. This rating must be given with 1) specific feedback as to which standards of professional performance were not met, 2) suggestions for improvement, and 3) a written commitment to assist the individual in accessing resources required for improvement. Improvement in performance is required within the next evaluation period.

**UN = Unsatisfactory (Unacceptable)**
This rating is given to those individuals who, during the rating period, did not meet the institution’s standards of professional performance. This rating represents performance that is not acceptable and/or is inconsistent with the conditions for continued employment with the institution. Failure to meet these standards in any one of the three following ways will result in a rating of “Unsatisfactory”:

1. Did not meet the institution’s standards of professional performance.
2. Received an “IR” rating the previous rating period but did not make the improvements required.
3. Consistently violated one or more of the institution’s standards of professional performance.

**2.1 Category I: Teaching**

“Excellence in teaching” is defined as a specifically designed interaction between the teacher and student so that higher-level learning occurs by the student which includes critical thinking and the application skills needed to be competitive in the workplace. As such, excellence in teaching requires faculty members to possess expertise not only within the content of their instruction, but also proficiency in instructional delivery, instructional design, student learning outcomes assessment, the design and effective use of instructional materials, and the appropriate and effective use of various forms of instructional technology.

To demonstrate “excellence in teaching,” a faculty member must show proficiency in the following four teaching roles: **a) Instructional Delivery Skills**, **b) Instructional Design Skills**, **c) Content Expertise**, and **d) Course Management**. These areas will be assessed on the evaluation instruments.
Definition of Teaching Roles

a. **Instructional Delivery Skills** are those human interactive skills and characteristics which 1) make for clear communication of information, concepts, and attitudes, and 2) promote or facilitate learning by creating an appropriate effective learning environment.

b. **Instructional Design Skills** are those technical skills in 1) designing, sequencing, and presenting experiences which induce student learning, and 2) designing, developing, and implementing tools and procedures for assessing student learning outcomes.

c. **Content Expertise** is that body of skills, competencies, and knowledge in a specific subject area in which the faculty member has received advanced education, training, and experience.

d. **Course Management** embraces those bureaucratic skills in operating and managing a course, including, but not limited to, timely grading of examinations, timely completion of drop/add and incomplete grade forms, maintaining published office hours, arranging for and coordinating guest lectures, and generally making arrangements for facilities and resources required in the teaching of a course.

For evaluation purposes, the following premises should guide academic departments and schools:

- Each faculty member shall receive an annual performance review for teaching effectiveness.
- Student instruments for rating faculty teaching performance must be distributed and collected during the last third of each semester. All classes, laboratories, and practicums must be rated by students.
- Teaching portfolios must be submitted by the date specified on the annual evaluation calendar (see Appendix D).
- Use multiple instruments to assess teaching effectiveness.
- The evaluation committee must review instructional materials as elements of a faculty member’s annual portfolio. These documents include syllabi, examinations, and other materials required by the college/school and departments.
- The appropriate use of instructional technology (as available) is to be fostered.

2.2 Category II: Scholarly Activity

“**Scholarly activities**” may be defined as those activities within a faculty member’s specified area of expertise that contribute to: the discovery of new knowledge; and/or the dissemination of knowledge within the professional community; and/or the development of personal professional skills and standing within the professional community.

“**Scholarship**” may include performance in research, consulting, presentations and

---

publications. For evaluation purposes, the following premises should guide academic departments and colleges/schools:

- Published research or creative work includes refereed and non-refereed publications.
- The value of a refereed publication will be twice that of a non-refereed publication.
- Credit for journal articles can be awarded for either the year of publication or the year of acceptance, but not for both.
- All authors on co-authored research articles, papers, books, and chapters in books will receive full and equal credit.
- Research articles published in conference proceedings are included as scholarly activities.
- The value of a non-published, orally delivered, research report, paper, or creative work presented at a professional meeting, e.g., a forum, workshop, or conference, will be one quarter that of a refereed journal article.
- Supervision of students’ research projects (as a principal advisor) is considered as scholarly activity.
- Preparation of book and journal reviews.
- Lending “significant assistance” to the author of a funded grant involves suggesting some specific information, editing, or serving as a consultant. It can also include intricate involvement in the planning phases of the grant.

“Grantsmanship” is defined as efforts to obtain grants (awards to the University for specific or general purposes). Consideration will be given in two areas: proposals submitted and proposals funded.

Evaluative factors for funded proposals will be developed by academic departments and will include the following:

- The scope and significance of grant(s), including the benefits to students, the department/college/school, and the University. “Significance” embraces the idea of positive, long-lasting impact.
- Renewal grants should be given the same consideration as the initial submission.
- The value of unfunded proposals submitted to funding agencies should be half that of funded grants.

2.3 Category III: Service and Professional Development

“Professional Service” is defined as contributions of faculty members, within their recognized area of expertise, to professional organizations, services, and events at either the local, state, national, or international level, without pay.

For evaluation purposes, academic departments and colleges/schools should consider the following activities:

- Participation in organizational or professional meetings, symposia, seminars, and colloquia other than those included under Scholarly Activities.
- Leadership in professional organizations to include Executive Boards, Organizational Committees, Panels of Judges, etc. Examples: National Alumni Associations, AAUP, VA Junior Academy of Science, VA Academy of Science, Sigma Xi, American Cancer Society, National Honor Society, Accreditation Commissions, etc.
· Professional service contributions to various sources such as print and broadcast media.
· Professional recognition through honors and awards.
· Serving as a paid consultant in one’s specialized area.

Within the category of “Professional Service,” the acceptance of honoraria will not be considered as payment for services.

“University Service” is defined as faculty work other than teaching and research, which contributes to the mission and goals of the University.

For evaluation purposes, the following premises should guide academic departments and colleges/schools:

· Participation in University-wide committees (including search and ad-hoc committees) and in the Faculty Senate, Robert C. Nusbaum Honors College, International Programs, Commencement/Convocation, special task forces, etc. with the nature and scope of the task to be considered and weighted accordingly.
· Voluntary participation in support of any departmental, college/school, or University-approved program or committee.
· Submission of ideas or grant-proposals for external funding that is not included in Scholarly Activity.
· Voluntary participation in activities that enhance student learning and/or enhance professional performance of colleagues.
· Presentations offered by faculty to the University community that are not included in Scholarly Activity.
· Participation in registration and academic advising.

“Professional Development” is defined as activities directed toward keeping abreast of events in one's recognized area of expertise and in acquiring additional knowledge and skills designed to improve one's teaching effectiveness and scholarly activities.

For evaluation purposes, the following premises should guide academic departments and colleges/schools:

· Attending state/national honors programs, seminars, symposia, workshops, and professional meetings.
· Studying toward a higher degree (e.g., Ph.D.).
· Serving as an unpaid consultant in one's specialized area.
· Completing courses and other training programs.
3.0 SCORING PROCEDURES

In order to give University-wide consistency to the faculty evaluation process, minimum weights are established for the standard categories. The Department will determine the exact weights within each category. The range of possible weights includes 15% and 10% discretionary assignments for the department and the faculty member, respectively. The 25% distribution must be allocated in increments of five (5) percentage points.

3.1 Distribution of Weights

The distribution of weights must comply with the criteria listed in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Range of Possible Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Teaching</td>
<td>40% - 65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Scholarly Activity</td>
<td>15% - 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Service and Professional Development</td>
<td>20% - 45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Distribution of Weights

The total weight for each category is the sum of the pre-determined minimum weight, the allocation of the departmental committee, and the faculty member’s allocation. This table weight is not to exceed the upper limit of the range for that category. The maximum weight for each line item within the category is the sum of the departmental distribution and the faculty member’s distribution. The departmental committee will designate its minimum weight for each line item. Faculty members will then allocate weights to line items from their 10% distributions. For example, suppose Professor Drake’s academic department allocates its 15% discretionary weight as 10% for scholarly activity and 5% for service and professional development, while Professor Drake allocates his entire discretionary assignment to the teaching category. The weight distributions that will be used for Professor Drake are illustrated in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Minimum Weights</th>
<th>Professor Drake’s Discretionary Weight</th>
<th>Department’s Discretionary Weight</th>
<th>Professor Drake’s Actual Weights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Activity</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Professional Development</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Distribution of Weights for Professor Drake
3.2 Source Weights

Faculty evaluations will be based on assessments by students, departmental committees, and department heads. **Department chairs will be evaluated by students, departmental committees, and deans.** As prescribed by the noted faculty evaluation expert, Dr. Raoul Arreola, weights allocated to each source are determined by judging “the opportunity that the source has to be a first-hand observer of the performance in question.” The source weights are presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Components</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Delivery Skills</td>
<td>Students: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Design Skills</td>
<td>Students: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Expertise</td>
<td>Students: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Management</td>
<td>Students: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Scholarly Activity</td>
<td>Students: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Professional Development and Service</td>
<td>Students: 0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Source Weights for Evaluation Categories

4.0 **SUBMISSION OF PORTFOLIO**

Each faculty member is required to submit a portfolio that adheres to the guidelines below. Portfolios must be submitted during the January-February period as specified in the annual faculty evaluation calendar (see Appendix D).

- Portfolio documentation should be provided for the previous calendar year (January-December).
- All forms and accompanying documentation must be submitted by the date and time specified in the annual faculty evaluation calendar.
- All portfolios should include vitae and course syllabi along with other documentation to support all of the categories of the evaluation form.
- Documentation should be labeled according to category and item number.
- Documentation should demonstrate evidence of good communication skills.
- Portfolio organization should be clear and easy to follow. A table of contents must be included with a section corresponding to each evaluation category. A sample table of contents is presented in Appendix E.
- Any discrete activity cannot be used in more than one category.

To be eligible for merit pay, a faculty member must submit a portfolio and submit it on time; otherwise, the departmental evaluation committee will be forced to complete an evaluation for that particular faculty member with whatever information is available.
5.0 **RELEASE TIME**

When a faculty member is released from teaching as a result of research grants or special assignments, the weight assigned to the teaching category should be reduced accordingly; and the evaluation category for which the release time is given should be increased accordingly. As indicated in Table 4, if Professor Drake is given 50% release time from teaching for research activities, then the weight of the teaching category is reduced to 25%, and the weight on Scholarly Activities should be increased to 50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>General Distribution</th>
<th>Distribution with Release Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Activity</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Professional Development</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4. Weights for Professor Drake with 50% Release Time from Teaching for Research*

6.0 **REALLOCATION OF MERIT PAY**

Merit pay is performance driven. This means that the performance score as indicated by the evaluation process will determine salary. The performance score is determined by the weights achieved in the three performance categories. Merit pay will be allocated in two stages: (1) first, through a percentage and (2) then, through shares. The percentage increase will be based on the average percentage allocated by the State and the annual performance evaluation score a faculty member earns. A share is a unit of compensation for merit. The monetary value of a share will vary annually and is contingent upon the funds remaining after percentage increases have been awarded and the total number of shares have been earned by all NSU faculty members. The calculation of percentage increases and shares is illustrated in sections 6.1 and 6.2.

The following performance ratings designate the percentage increase:

- 2.79 or below - zero (0) percentage, no merit pay increase
- 2.80 – 3.09 - 70% of the average salary rate increase for the University
  For example, if the average increase is 5%, an individual scoring in this range would get a 3.5% increase
- 3.10 - 3.39 - 80% of the average salary rate increase for the University
- 3.40 - 3.69 - 90% of the average salary rate increase for the University
- 3.70 - 4.00 - 100% of the average salary rate increase for the University
In addition to percentage increases, share values will be awarded based on the following ranges of scores:

- 2.79 or below - zero (0) shares, no merit pay increase
- 2.80 – 3.09 - one share
- 3.10 - 3.39 - two shares
- 3.40 - 3.69 - three shares
- 3.70 - 4.00 - four shares

### 6.1 Example

Assume the State University at Bayview has an annual faculty payroll of $100,000. The State legislature has appropriated a 10% pay increase for faculty at Bayview. This means that $10,000 is available for merit pay increases. In summary, we have the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Faculty Payroll</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty pay increase</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total dollar value of increase</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The State University at Bayview has four faculty members whose names, performance ratings, percent increase, and allocated shares are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
<th>Percent Increase</th>
<th>Shares Awarded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>10% (100% of 10%)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>8% (80% of 10%)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>7% (70% of 10%)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5. Calculation of Percent Increases and Shares**

### 6.2 Calculation of Increases

Merit pay increases are calculated using a two-step procedure. First, based on the performance evaluation rating, a percentage increase is determined for each faculty member. Given the ratings above, the percentage salary increases for Bayview faculty are:

- Bozeman: 10% of $20,000 \( (.10 \times 20,000) = $2,000 \)
- Brown: 0% of $45,000 \( (0 \times 45,000) = $0 \)
- Wilson: 8% of $25,000 \( (.08 \times 25,000) = $2,000 \)
- Woods: 7% of $10,000 \( (.07 \times 10,000) = $700 \)

**Total** \( $4,700 \)

The second step of the procedure is the calculation of the share value. The share value is contingent on the number of shares awarded in the performance evaluation process. Given the performance ratings above, Bozeman, Wilson, and Woods will receive 4, 2, 1 shares,
respectively. Brown receives no shares. The share value, $757, is calculated using the following formula:

\[
\text{Total funds available for salary increases} - \text{total percentage salary increases}) / (\text{total shares awarded}) = \frac{($10,000 - $4,700)}{7} = \frac{$5,300}{7} = $757
\]

The salary increases attributed to shares are:

- Bozeman: 4 x $757 = $3,028
- Brown: 0 x $757 = $0
- Wilson: 2 x $757 = $1,514
- Woods: 1 x $757 = $757

New salaries are calculated by adding the percentage increase and share increase to the current salary. A summary of the procedure is presented in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
<th>Current Salary</th>
<th>Percentage Increase</th>
<th>Share Increase</th>
<th>New Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bozeman</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$3,028</td>
<td>$25,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilson</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$1,514</td>
<td>$28,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$700</td>
<td>$757</td>
<td>$11,457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$4,700</td>
<td>$5,299</td>
<td>$109,999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Calculation of New Salaries

7.0 PROCESS COMPLIANCE

Establish a “Process Compliance Committee” in each school to assess the adherence to the guidelines noted in the Teaching Faculty Handbook as they apply to:

- Faculty submission of Portfolio.
- School/Departmental Evaluation Committee’s compliance with guidelines in evaluating faculty portfolios.
- Appointment of the members of the “Process Compliance Committee” by the respective deans.
- Members of the “Process Compliance Committee” include at least one (1) person from each department in the School.
Appendix A

EVALUATION INSTRUMENTS

Evaluation Scoring Sheets for:

- STUDENTS
- DEPARTMENT CHAIR/DEAN
- PEERS
- SUMMARY FORMS
# EVALUATION SCORING SHEET, CATEGORY I: TEACHING

**Source:** Students

## Face-to-Face Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>During the first week of class the instructor provided and explained the syllabus.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The course materials (textual and/or web based), assignments, exams, class discussions, activities, projects and/or papers in this class have increased my understanding of the subject.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The instructor has utilized a variety of teaching techniques and methods.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The instructor has created a climate for students’ participation in class or online.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The instructor has provided feedback to improve my learning.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The instructor’s presentations have been informative regarding the subject matter of the course.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The instructor has been successful in communicating the subject matter of the course.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The instructor has met classes consistently and generally has been punctual.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The instructor has been available for consultation during scheduled office hours, by appointment.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The instructor has shown consideration and respect.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>All things considered, the instructor has been an effective teacher.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>All things considered, the course has been a positive learning experience.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Averages** | 3.50 | 3.61 | 3.56

## Online Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>During the first week of class the instructor provided and explained the syllabus.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>The instructor was consistent in following the syllabus.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The course materials (textual and/or web based), assignments, exams, class discussions, activities, projects and/or papers in this class have increased my understanding of the subject.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The instructor has utilized a variety of teaching techniques.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The instructor has created a format to increase students’ accessibility online.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The instructor has provided feedback to improve my learning.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The minimum amounts of time per week needed for online interactions, study and homework assignments were clearly stated in the syllabus.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The presentations and required text have been informative regarding the subject matter of the course.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The instructor has been successful in communicating the subject matter of the course.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>The instructor has consistently facilitated discussions.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The instructor has been available for consultation during scheduled office hours and/or by appointment.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>The instructor has been professional and shown consideration and respect.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The instructor has regularly communicated in the class via electronic means (e.g., emails, announcements, discussions boards, etc.).</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>All things considered, the instructor has been an effective instructor.</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I have logged in and participated fully in the course as instructed in the syllabus.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I would enroll in another online course.</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Averages** | 3.65 | 3.55 | 3.60
Teaching Faculty Evaluation
Forms for Department Chair/Dean

Faculty Name: _______________________ ID Number: __________

Department: __________________________________________

College/School: ________________________________________

Rank: ___________________________ Tenure: Yes _____ No _____

Date Began Service: ________________________________

Today’s Date: ________________________________
Instructions: For the items below rate the faculty member from 1 to 4 according to the Item Rating Scale given to the right. **All items in the Teaching Category must be evaluated.** For each of the teaching roles A and B, an average will automatically be computed by the Faculty Evaluation Spreadsheet. Please write these averages in the “Averages Column” for each respective teaching role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Ratings</th>
<th>Exemplary = 4</th>
<th>Professional = 3</th>
<th>Improvement Required = 2</th>
<th>Unsatisfactory = 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### A. Instructional Design
The extent to which the faculty member:

1. Has syllabi which follow University Guidelines.
2. Creates assignments, projects, and/or exams related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
3. Designs instructional activities clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
4. Identifies course materials, including textbook, which are clearly related to course outcome(s).
5. Employs instructional materials appropriate for the target student population.
6. Uses “up-to-date” course materials.
7. Prepares assignments, handouts, exams, and activities to promote student interest and enhance learning.

**Instructional Design Rating**

### B. Content Expertise
The extent to which the faculty member:

1. Demonstrates knowledge of discipline.
2. Demonstrates competence with course content that is relevant and thorough.
3. Uses instructional technology which is clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
4. Uses instructional technology to promote mastery of concept(s) or content of the course.

**Content Expertise Rating**

### C. Course Management
The extent to which the faculty member:

1. Submits required reports and documents as directed.
2. Is available to students outside class.

**Course Management Rating**
DEPARTMENT CHAIR/DEAN
EVALUATION SCORING SHEET

CATEGORY II: RESEARCH—SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY AND GRANTSMANSHIP

**Instructions:** Some of the items below are required by the department, while others are selected by the faculty member for evaluation. In the second column, mark required items with an “R” and mark selected items with an “S.” Items not so marked must not be evaluated. For the marked items below rate the faculty member from 1 to 4 according to the Item Rating Scale given to the right. For the Research Category an average will automatically be computed by the Faculty Evaluation Spreadsheet. Please write this average in the “Averages Column” at the bottom of the page for the “Scholarly Activity Rating.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items to be Evaluated (R=Required, S=Selected)</th>
<th>Item Ratings</th>
<th>Averages Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Publishes papers in journals and conference proceedings within teaching field or area of specialization.
2. Writes books or chapters in books in teaching field or area of specialization.
3. Presents papers in the teaching or related field for delivery at professional meetings.
4. Devises, produces, or performs creative works related to one’s teaching or allied field.
5. Designs, constructs, or produces technical applications or policy reports related to one’s teaching or allied field.
6. Submits through University channels a grant proposal.
7. Acquires funding for grants.
8. Lends significant assistance to the author of a funded grant.
9. Receives renewal of grants at the expected level.
10. Serves as a paid consultant in one’s specialized area.
11. Supervises research projects.
12. Reviews manuscripts, books, journals and articles.

**Scholarly Activity Rating:**
### DEPARTMENT CHAIR/DEAN EVALUATION SCORING SHEET

#### CATEGORY III: SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

**Instructions:** Some of the items below are required by the department, while others are selected by the faculty member for evaluation. In the second column, mark required items with an “R” and mark selected items with an “S.” Items not so marked must not be evaluated. For the **marked items** below rate the faculty member from 1 to 4 according to the Item Rating Scale given to the right. For the Service and Professional Development Category an average will automatically be computed by the Faculty Evaluation Spreadsheet. Please write this average in the “Averages Column” at the bottom of the page for the “Service and Professional Development Rating.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items to be Evaluated (R=Required, S=Selected)</th>
<th>Item Ratings</th>
<th>Averages Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exemplary = 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement Required = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### A. Professional Service*

*Within the category of Professional Service, honoraria will not be considered as payment for services.*

**is defined as contributions of faculty members, within their recognized area of expertise, to professional organizations, services, and events at either the local, state, national, or international level, without pay.**

For evaluation purposes, academic departments and colleges/schools should consider the following activities:

1. Participation in organizational or professional meetings, symposia, seminars, and colloquia other than those included under Scholarly Activity.

2. Leadership in professional organizations to include Executive Boards, Organizational Committees, Panels of Judges, etc.

3. Invitations to serve on review committees and boards for peer-reviewing.

4. Professional service contributions to various sources such as print and broadcast media.

5. Professional recognition through honors and awards.

6. Service as an unpaid consultant in one’s areas of expertise.

---

*A Within the category of Professional Service, honoraria will not be considered as payment for services.*
### B. University Service

University Service is defined as faculty work other than teaching and research that contributes to the mission and goals of the university.

For evaluation purposes, the following premises should guide academic departments and colleges/schools:

1. Service on university-wide committees (including search and ad-hoc committees) and in the Faculty Senate, Robert C. Nusbaum Honors College, International Programs, Commencement/Convocation, special task forces, etc. with the nature and scope of the task to be considered and weighted accordingly.

2. Voluntary participation in support of any departmental, college/school, or university approved program or committee.

3. Submission of ideas or grant-proposals for external funding that is not included in Scholarly Activity.

4. Voluntary participation in activities that enhance student learning and/or enhance professional performance of colleagues.

5. Presentations offered by faculty to the university community that are not included in Scholarly Activity.

6. Participation in academic advising.

### C. Professional Development

Professional Development is defined as activities directed toward keeping abreast of events in one’s recognized area of expertise and in acquiring additional knowledge and skills designed to improve one’s teaching effectiveness and scholarly activities.

For evaluation purposes, academic departments and colleges/schools should consider the following activities:

1. Attending state/national honors programs, seminars, symposia, workshops, and professional meetings.

2. Studying toward a higher degree (e.g., Ph.D.).

3. Serving as an unpaid consultant in one’s specialized area.

4. Completing courses and other training programs.

**Service and Professional Development Rating**
### DEPARTMENT CHAIR/DEAN
### COMPOSITE ROLE RATINGS (CRR)

Faculty Name: _______________________________  ID Number: _______________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ratings (CRR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Instructional Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Content Expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Course Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Research—Scholarly Activity and Grantsmanship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Service and Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Department Chair/Dean Evaluation**

Signature below acknowledges that the Teaching Faculty Evaluation Instrument has been completed as of the date indicated.

__________________________________________________
Department Chair’s/Dean’s Name

____________________________________  __________
Signature (Department Chair/Dean)        Date
Teaching Faculty Evaluation
Forms for Peers (Committee)

Faculty Name: __________________________ ID Number: ____________
Department: ______________________________________________________
College/School: __________________________________________________
Rank: ____________________________ Tenure: Yes ____ No _____
Date Began Service: ________________________________________________
Today’s Date: _____________________________________________________
**PEERS (COMMITTEE)**
**EVALUATION SCORING SHEET**

**CATEGORY I: TEACHING**

**Instructions:** For the items below rate the faculty member from 1 to 4 according to the Item Rating Scale given to the right. **All items in the Teaching Category must be evaluated.** For each of the teaching roles A and B, an average will automatically be computed by the Faculty Evaluation Spreadsheet. Please write these averages in the “Averages Column” for each respective teaching role.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Ratings</th>
<th>Averages Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A. Instructional Design

The extent to which the faculty member:

1. Has syllabi which follow University Guidelines.
2. Creates assignments, projects, and/or exams related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
3. Designs instructional activities clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
4. Identifies course materials, including textbook, which are clearly related to course outcome(s).
5. Employs instructional materials appropriate for the target student population.
6. Uses “up-to-date” course materials.
7. Prepares assignments, handouts, exams, and activities to promote student interest and enhance learning.

*Instructional Design Rating*

### B. Content Expertise

The extent to which the faculty member:

1. Demonstrates knowledge of discipline.
2. Demonstrates competence with course content that is relevant and thorough.
3. Uses instructional technology which is clearly related to the outcome(s) identified for the course.
4. Uses instructional technology to promote mastery of concept(s) or content of the course.

*Content Expertise Rating*
**PEERS (COMMITTEE)**  
**EVALUATION SCORING SHEET**  

**CATEGORY II: RESEARCH—SCHOLARLY ACTIVITY AND GRANTSMANSHIP**

**Instructions:** Some of the items below are required by the department, while others are selected by the faculty member for evaluation. In the second column, mark required items with an “R” and mark selected items with an “S.” Items not so marked must not be evaluated. For the **marked items** below rate the faculty member from 1 to 4 according to the Item Rating Scale given to the right. For the Research Category an average will automatically be computed by the Faculty Evaluation Spreadsheet. Please write this average in the “Averages Column” at the bottom of the page for the “Scholarly Activity Rating.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items to be Evaluated (R=Required, S=Selected)</th>
<th>Item Ratings</th>
<th>Averages Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary = 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional = 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Required = 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsatisfactory = 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Publishes papers in journals and conference proceedings within teaching field or area of specialization.
2. Writes books or chapters in books in teaching field or area of specialization.
3. Presents papers in the teaching or related field for delivery at professional meetings.
4. Devises, produces, or performs creative works related to one’s teaching or allied field.
5. Designs, constructs, or produces technical applications or policy reports related to one’s teaching or allied field.
6. Submits through University channels a grant proposal.
7. Acquires funding for grants.
8. Lends significant assistance to the author of a funded grant.
9. Receives renewal of grants at the expected level.
10. Serves as a paid consultant in one’s specialized area.
11. Supervises research projects.
12. Reviews manuscripts, books, journals and articles.

**Scholarly Activity Rating**
**PEERS (COMMITTEE) EVALUATION SCORING SHEET**

**CATEGORY III: SERVICE AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Instructions:** Some of the items below are required by the department, while others are selected by the faculty member for evaluation. In the second column, mark required items with an “R” and mark selected items with an “S.” Items not so marked must not be evaluated. For the **marked items** below rate the faculty member from 1 to 4 according to the Item Rating Scale given to the right. For the Service and Professional Development Category an average will automatically be computed by the Faculty Evaluation Spreadsheet. Please write this average in the “Averages Column” at the bottom of the page for the “Service and Professional Development Rating.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items to be Evaluated (R=Required, S=Selected)</th>
<th>Item Ratings</th>
<th>Averages Column</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exemplary = 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional = 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvement Required = 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsatisfactory = 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. Professional Service** is defined as contributions of faculty members, within their recognized area of expertise, to professional organizations, services, and events at either the local, state, national, or international level, without pay.

For evaluation purposes, academic departments and colleges/schools should consider the following activities:

1. Participation in organizational or professional meetings, symposia, seminars, and colloquia other than those included under Scholarly Activity.
2. Leadership in professional organizations to include Executive Boards, Organizational Committees, Panels of Judges, etc.
3. Invitations to serve on review committees and boards for peer-reviewing.
4. Professional service contributions to various sources such as print and broadcast media.
5. Professional recognition through honors and awards.
6. Service as an unpaid consultant in one’s areas of expertise.

*Within the category of Professional Service, honoraria will not be considered as payment for services.*
**B. University Service** is defined as faculty work other than teaching and research that contributes to the mission and goals of the university.

For evaluation purposes, the following premises should guide academic departments and colleges/schools:

1. Service on university-wide committees (including search and ad-hoc committees) and in the Faculty Senate, Robert C. Nusbaum Honors College, International Programs, Commencement/Convocation, special task forces, etc. with the nature and scope of the task to be considered and weighted accordingly.

2. Voluntary participation in support of any departmental, college/school, or university approved program or committee.

3. Submission of ideas or grant-proposals for external funding that is not included in Scholarly Activity.

4. Voluntary participation in activities that enhance student learning and/or enhance professional performance of colleagues.

5. Presentations offered by faculty to the university community that are not included in Scholarly Activity.

6. Participation in academic advising.

**C. Professional Development** is defined as activities directed toward keeping abreast of events in one’s recognized area of expertise and in acquiring additional knowledge and skills designed to improve one’s teaching effectiveness and scholarly activities.

For evaluation purposes, academic departments and colleges/schools should consider the following activities:

1. Attending state/national honors programs, seminars, symposia, workshops, and professional meetings.

2. Studying toward a higher degree (e.g., Ph.D.).

3. Serving as an unpaid consultant in one’s specialized area.

4. Completing courses and other training programs.

**Service and Professional Development Rating**
# PEERS (COMMITTEE)
## COMPOSITE ROLE RATINGS (CRR)

Faculty Name: ________________________________  ID Number: ____________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ratings (CRR)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Teaching</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Instructional Design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Content Expertise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Research—Scholarly Activity and Grantsmanship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Service and Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Peer (Committee) Evaluation

Signature below acknowledges that the Teaching Faculty Evaluation Instrument has been completed as of the date indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature (Peer Facilitator)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature (Peer)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature (Peer)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature (Peer)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature (Peer)</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Teaching Faculty Evaluation Summary Forms

Faculty Name: ___________________________ ID Number: ____________

Department: _______________________________________________________

College/School: ____________________________________________________

Rank: ___________________________ Tenure: Yes____ No ______

Date Began Service: _________________________________________________

Today’s Date: _____________________________________________________
### TABLE 1: Composite Role Rating for Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Department Head</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Delivery Skills</td>
<td>30% X [ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Design Skills</td>
<td>10% X [ ]</td>
<td>20% X</td>
<td>10% X [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td>20% X</td>
<td>5% X [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% X [ ]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPOSITE ROLE RATING (CRR) FOR TEACHING**

### TABLE 2: Category Weights

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Minimum Weights</th>
<th>Department’s Discretionary Weight</th>
<th>Faculty’s Discretionary Weight</th>
<th>Faculty’s Category Weights (Without Release-time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Activity</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Professional Development</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3: Distribution Weights with Release-Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Faculty’s Category Weights (without Release-Time)</th>
<th>Release-Time</th>
<th>Final Distribution Weights (with Release-time)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 4: Final Evaluation Rating Computation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Final Distributions</th>
<th>Composite Role Rating</th>
<th>Weighted Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly Activity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation Rating
Comments by Department Chair and Peers (Committee):

Signature below acknowledges that the Teaching Faculty Evaluation Instrument has been completed as of the date indicated.

Signature (Department Chair)  
Title  
Date

Signature (Committee)  
Title  
Date

Signature (Committee)  
Title  
Date

Signature (Committee)  
Title  
Date

Signature (Committee)  
Title  
Date

Signature (Faculty)  
Title  
Date

Comments by Faculty Member:

Signature below acknowledges that the Department Chair and a representative from my Peers (Committee) have reviewed this completed Teaching Faculty Evaluation as of the date indicated.

Signature (Faculty)  
Title  
Date
Appendix B

Sample Computation
SAMPLE COMPUTATION

Consider Professor Drake, who was evaluated by the three sources with the following ratings:

**Students:**
- Instructional Delivery – 4
- Instructional Design – 3

**Peers:**
- Instructional Design – 3
- Content Expertise – 4

**Dept. Chair:**
- Instructional Design – 3
- Content Expertise – 3
- Course Management – 2

Substituting the above ratings into the formula sheet, TABLE 4, as shown below [See Arreola, R.A. (2000), pages 51-55], will result in a **Composite Role Rating (CRR)** for Professor Drake of **3.45** for teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>Dept. Head</th>
<th>Weighted Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Delivery</td>
<td>30% X [4]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content Expertise</td>
<td></td>
<td>20% X [4]</td>
<td>5% X [3]</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% X [2]</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMPOSITE ROLE RATING (CRR) FOR TEACHING**

3.45
Professor Drake was evaluated in categories II and III with the following composite ratings:

**Peers:**
- II. Scholarly Activity: 3.0
- III. Service and Professional Development: 4.0

**Dept. Chair:**
- II. Scholarly Activity: 3.0
- III. Service and Professional Development: 3.0

Substituting the above ratings into the formula sheet, TABLE 5, as shown below [See Arreola, R.A. (2000), pages 51-55], will result in a **Composite Role Rating (CRR)** for Professor Drake of **3.00** for scholarly activity, and **3.70** for service and professional development.

The actual evaluation rating for Professor Drake would be based on the weight distributions a school or department and the faculty member (allocating his 15%) assign to the various categories. For example, given the following distributions:

I. Teaching: 50%
II. Scholarly Activity: 25%
III. Service and Professional Development: 25%

Professor Drake’s rating is computed as follows:

\[
50\% \times [3.45] + 25\% \times [3.00] + 25\% \times [3.70] = 3.40
\]
Appendix C

ANNUAL EVALUATION CALENDAR FOR

JANUARY 1, 20XX - DECEMBER 31, 20XX
## EVALUATION CALENDAR PLAN
for
Evaluation Year January 1, 20XX – December 31, 20XX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Establishment of School Process Compliance Committee</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>August 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Formation of Departmental Evaluation and Merit Pay Committee</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>August 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Dissemination of evaluation packet with due dates to faculty</td>
<td>Dean, Department Chair</td>
<td>December 15, 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Departmental distribution of weights to categories of the evaluation</td>
<td>Departmental Faculty</td>
<td>January 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Notification of the nature and schedule of the appeal process</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>October 15, 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Distribution of Student Assessment Instruments</td>
<td>Academic Affairs, ITS</td>
<td>Last third of each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Completion of Student Assessment</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Last third of each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Receipt and transmission of Student Assessment Instruments</td>
<td>ITS</td>
<td>Last third of each semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Distribution of results of student assessments for spring/fall semesters 20XX</td>
<td>Academic Affairs</td>
<td>By January 15, 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Submission of portfolios</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>By deadline established by the Office of Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Completion of faculty evaluations by Department Chair</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>By January deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Completion of Peer evaluation</td>
<td>Departmental Evaluation and Merit Pay Committee</td>
<td>By January deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Tabulation of Composite Score for faculty evaluation</td>
<td>Departmental Evaluation and Merit Pay Committee</td>
<td>By January deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Conference with individual faculty members</td>
<td>Chairperson of the Departmental Evaluation and Merit Pay Committee</td>
<td>By February 8, 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Submission of departmental report and recommendations to the Dean</td>
<td>Chairperson of the Departmental Evaluation and Merit Pay Committee</td>
<td>By February 15, 20XX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Submission of school report and recommendations to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>By deadline established by the Office of Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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